

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 10B.

Attachment: Replacement sheet

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the consideration of the present application afforded by the Examiner. Claims 1-17 are pending. Claim 18 was previously canceled. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Drawings

The drawings filed on September 26, 2006 have been objected to by the Examiner. More specifically, the Examiner has objected to Figure 10B. The Examiner asserts that Figure 10B is incorrectly labeled with "B1" whereas it should read "B2". In light of the submission of a replacement drawing for Figure 10B accepting the Examiner's suggestion, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

The Examiner asserts there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the one end", "the other end" in claim 1. However, in the following recitation of claim 1, "one end" can be recognized as the antecedent basis for the "the one end" and naturally for "the other end":

"wherein

at least the first electrode group includes a plurality of electrode patterns which are each connected to a drive circuit at one end, and are different in length from the one end to the other end."

Thus, there is sufficient antecedent basis for "the one end" and "the other end" in claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner asserts there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the corresponding one ends" in line 27 of claim 1. In light of the amendment to claim 1, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner asserts there is insufficient antecedent basis for “the connection region” in line 28 of claim 1. In light of the amendment to claim 1, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner asserts that it is confusing to refer to “the plurality of electrode patterns” in lines 15, 18, 21, 23, 24, 25 and 26 of claim 1 when claim 1 recites “a first electrode group made up of a plurality of electrode patterns” and “a second electrode group made up of a plurality of electrode patterns”. However, Applicants submit that each reference to “the plurality of electrode patterns” is preceded by “each of”. Thus, it is clear that “the plurality of electrode patterns” refers to “each of the plurality of electrode patterns”. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner asserts that it is unclear what is meant by “the length of the higher resistance region is reduced with the length of the electrode patterns”. In light of the amendment to claim 2, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Masataka

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Masataka et al. (“Masataka”, JP 10-339880). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 clearly recites, *inter alia*, “the location of said first conductor pattern and said second conductor pattern are mutually displaced”. However, Masataka does not teach, disclose or suggest this feature. In the claimed invention, when this displacement arises in the manufacturing process, a resistance controlling effect can be obtained by the present invention by eliminating lower resistance patterns. Masataka, however, does not teach or suggest this feature and Applicants submit that this rejection should be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons stated above, independent claim 1 is patentably distinct from Masataka. Claims 2-17 are at least allowable by virtue of their dependency on corresponding allowable independent claim.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested to withdraw this obviousness rejection of claims 1-17 based on Masataka.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Charu K. Mehta, Reg. No. 62,913, at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 8, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

D. Richard Anderson
Registration No.: 40,439
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicants

Attachment: Drawings